



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

prepare the way for the conclusion. Briefly it may be said, that general evidence, biographical and historical facts connected with the lives and work of the two poets, furnishes, at best, only a hint of possible literary relationship. The subject matter which engaged the thoughts of these writers differed widely. In versification the *Moral Satires*, by comparison with regard to the position of the simple cæsura and the omission of the end pause, show a more marked departure from Pope's style than is evident in Churchill's satires. The sentence in Cowper bears no mark of Churchill's manner, but was of gradual development from the *Progress of Error* to *Retirement*. As to turn of phrase nothing tangible was found favoring the idea of special resemblance.

The conclusion is not far to seek. The often reiterated statement, that the *Moral Satires* of Cowper were modeled after the satires of Charles Churchill, is traditional and untrue.

We may close by expressing our confidence in Cowper's own statement concerning his literary independence. His utterance is especially pertinent to our present consideration, since it was written in private correspondence and at the time when the *Moral Satires* were in press. In a letter to Rev. William Unwin, dated Nov. 24, 1781, Cowper says:

"I reckon it among my principal advantages, as a composer of verse, that I have not read an English poet these thirteen years, and but one these twenty years. Imitation even of the best models, is my aversion; it is servile and mechanical, a trick that has enabled many to usurp the name of authors, who could not have written at all, if they had not written upon the pattern of somebody indeed original."¹¹

EUGENE D. HOLMES.

Adelbert College.

NOTES ON THE ROMANS D'AVENTURE.

THE first instalment of Gröber's article on French literature, issued with the continuation of the second volume of the *Grundriss*,¹ devotes considerable attention to those interesting poems of love and adventure which give, perhaps, the best presentation of aristocratic

¹¹ Cowper's Works, vol. i, p. 374-5.

¹ *Grundriss der Romanischen Philologie*, herausgegeben von Gustav Gröber. II. Band, 1. Abteilung, 3. Lieferung. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1898. 8vo, pp. 433-688. *Französische Literatur*, von Gustav Gröber.

manners and ideals in mediæval France. From their spirit and tone, and especially from the purpose which prompted them they might very well be brought under one head, as "Romans d'aventure." Gröber discusses them under two headings ("Romans d'aventure" and "Ausflüsse der gelehrten Epik"), which is a great advance over the minute divisions made by G. Paris in his *Littérature française au moyen âge*. It so happens that the poems thus treated are all accessible to American students, save *Florimont*, and having read them recently in preparation for a course of lectures at Baltimore, I had intended to call the attention of the readers of the NOTES to them in a somewhat extended article. Gröber's publication having anticipated such a plan, it is now in order to offer only those data that are supplementary to his remarks or which lead to different conclusions.

The paragraph on Gautier of Arras' *Éracle* assumes that the Baldwin of Hainault for whom the poem was finished was Baldwin IV († 1171, not 1176). It had seemed to me that it might be rather Baldwin V on account of the lines 6584-6586 of Löseth's edition:

Quens Bauduins, a vous l'otroi:
Ainz que passent dui an ou troi,
Metrai ailleurs, espoir, m'entente.

Contrary to Förster's opinion, expressed in the introduction to *Ille et Galeron*,³ that this was an intimation of a change of patron—which Gautier's career would abundantly justify—I had interpreted the couplet in a sense more favorable to Baldwin: that Gautier was now advanced in years and was looking towards another world. If this is so, the last section of *Éracle* would necessarily be later than *Ille et Galeron*. The lines cited by Förster in support of such a period for the completion of *Éracle*,

En dis et set anz et demi
Ne trueuve om pas un bon ami;⁴

are not, however, convincing to me. The views of G. Paris and of Tobler⁶ in regard to the numerals used by the mediæval poets, here as elsewhere, appear more tenable. And in explanation of this exact "seventeen and a half years," which is undoubtedly peculiar, it may be said that the hero was of that

² Gröber, *l. c.*, pp. 525-526. ³ *Roman. Bibl.*, vol. vii.

⁴ *Éracle*, 6568-6569.

⁵ *Romania*, vol. xxv, p. 277, note 3.

⁶ Herrig's *Archiv*, vol. xci, pp. 104-105.

age when he returned with Laïs from the war:—he was nearly ten years old when he was sold to the emperor,⁷ the latter had been married more than seven years before imprisoning Athanaïs and going to the war,⁸ and she had been shut up six months before her adventure with Parides.⁹

Éracle was written for three patrons, and it is interesting to note that it is divided into three parts. The first and third parts form a continuous narrative, while the second part contains an extraneous episode. It is this episode which takes the poem out of the ranks of didactic literature, for only here is there any love affair. Near the beginning of the book¹⁰ Gautier gives a summary of his story, in which there is no allusion whatever to this episode, while the conclusion is stated as it was afterwards written out. Gautier is also conscious of this omission when he comes to introduce the episode:¹¹

Si li conquist si grant hôneur
Com de le croiz nostre signeur.
Ne vueil pas ci entrelacier
L'ahan qu'il ot al pourchacier,
Qu'ensi ne vait pas li matiere;
Ainz dirai l'uevre toute entiere
De nostre empeureur Laïs
Et de se feme Athanaïs,
Et del hôneur vous dirai puis
Qu'Éracles ot, et, se je puis,
Après dirai de cele croiz, etc.

Now, in the prologue to his poem Gautier has a dedication to count Theobald of Blois,¹² with allusions to the death of the count's father and Theobald's heirship of his "name and grace."¹³ But afterwards at the end, in the epilogue, he says he wrote at the order of Theobald, and also at the order of the countess Mary, daughter of Louis,¹⁴ and then finished the poem at Baldwin's request. So there seems no risk in assuming that the first part of *Éracle* (to line 2916 or thereabouts) was written for Theobald V of Blois, and the love episode, which was not included in the summary, for the other patron, who is named only at the end, Mary of Champagne. The episode, too, is wholly in the style of Mary's court literature,¹⁵ discussing as it does the essence of "fine amour," and containing erotic soliloquies and debates. Finally, Baldwin, noticing that the original plot

had not been completed, ordered it finished. The junction of this conclusion with the love episode is made in lines 5117-5121:

Il n'afiert pas a me matere
Que je plus die de Laïs,
De Paridès, d'Athanaïs;
Iceus vous lairai or en pais;
Si vous dirai d'Éracle huimaïs.

The change of patron from Theobald of Blois to Mary was rendered all the more easy by the marriage of the latter to Henry of Champagne, Theobald's older brother, in 1164, and by the counter-alliance of Mary's sister Alice with Theobald himself about the same time. It is fair to assume that the poem was begun soon after Theobald's accession to his estates (1152), since the mention of Theobald IV points to the recent demise of the latter. The episode of Laïs and Athanaïs would then have been added after Mary's marriage in 1164, and the conclusion appended some years later. It is, then, more than probable that the first and second parts of *Éracle* were written before *Ille et Galeron*, whether the last part was or not.

If we allow that the episode of Laïs and Athanaïs was inserted into *Éracle* to please Mary of Champagne, we may gain from it some notion of her influence on the tone of contemporaneous love literature. For the love inculcated by it is wholly shameless. Athanaïs eludes the vigilance of her warders and meets her lover Parides, with all the disregard for marital virtue and good name among women which characterized the heroines of the East or Iseult herself. She has neither innate morality nor concern for appearances. And yet the latter notion was rife in the fiction of the time, though it was evidently not fostered at Mary's court. Chrétien's *Cliges*,¹⁶ which precedes the poems written by him at Mary's command, is an instance of a woman's regard for her reputation. Though in love with Cliges, and married to another against her will, Fenice will not consent to grant her favors to her lover. Further than that, in order to escape the evil fame of Iseult, who gave her heart to one man and shared her body with two,¹⁷ she calls on Thessala's magic to aid her in deceiving her husband. And when the magic is successful and her virginity is preserved, she still resists the pleadings of

⁷ *Éracle*, 287.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 299.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 3914.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 95-122.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 2914-2924.

¹² *Ibid.*, 53.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 62.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 6553.

¹⁵ See Chrétien de Troyes and others.

¹⁶ Grüber, *l. c.*, pp. 499-500.

¹⁷ *Cliges*, 3145-3164.

her lover to fly with him to Brittany, as Helen did with Paris to Troy, by citing the blame which the world meted out to Tristan and Iseult.¹⁸ The conclusion that she reached was that in order to preserve her reputation, as she had preserved her virtue, she must die in the eyes of the world and be buried. Then only could the desires of her lover be secretly gratified.

It is quite clear that this idea of chastity, though only nominal perhaps, was not cultivated by the countess of Champagne, at least in her relations with her poets. *Éracle* is a proof of this, and Chrétien's *Charrete*, for which Mary furnished the poet both "matière et sans,"¹⁹ and where the relations of Lancelot with the Queen are narrated with the same lack of moral sense that is apparent in the story of Lais and Athanaïs. From this fact we may draw the further inference that Mary was not Chrétien's patroness at the time of the composition of *Cliges*.

Cliges, however, does not stand alone among the Old-French poems of this class in the inculcation of outward morality, or even of genuine morality. The plot of *Athis et Prophlias*,²⁰ where the heroine is deceived by her own husband to the profit of her lover, continues the idea advanced by Fenice in *Cliges* of possession by one man only.²¹ In *Partonopeus de Blois*²² Melior is advised to marry Partonopeus, since if she takes any other knight for a husband she will have been possessed by two men.²³ Absolute continence on the part of both sexes forms a portion of the moral in *Ipomedon*,²⁴ while the arguments of Fenice are repeated and carried out to a logical end by the heroine of *Amadas et Idoine*.²⁵ This heroine is also a married woman who has summoned magical powers to her assistance in deterring her husband from enjoying his marital rights, and who successfully withstands her lover's urging (the situation here is something like the one in *Cliges*) until she can be divorced and legally united to him.²⁶ In this practical way the problem posed by *Cliges* is finally solved.

It would seem, then, as though the French

literature of the twelfth century contained a trilogy on the subject of love for a married woman: in *Tristan* a love unconstrained by personal morality or public opinion, in *Cliges* responding to the appeals of both (but the latter much more than the former), and settled according to the best private and public interests of all concerned in *Amadas et Idoine*. The burden of the three poems is the essence of true love, what it is and how expressed, as it is indeed the absorbing theme of all the earlier *romans d'aventure*. In view of such circumstantial evidence, it would appear that Mary of Champagne was not in touch with the best thought of her time on this question.

From the close connection of ideas between *Cliges* and *Amadas et Idoine*, such as the interest revealed by both poems in the story of Tristan and Iseult, and the resemblance of certain agencies in bringing about the desired result, magic for instance and the supposed death of the heroine, one might assume that they were quite approximate in time. But an examination of *Amadas* does not confirm this notion. *Cliges* must have been written before 1172,²⁷ while the part played by the Count of Nevers in *Amadas* is so uncomplimentary as to preclude the probability of its having been composed before 1181, the date of the death of the last Count of Nevers and Auxerre. The choice of characters may indeed have been determined by the reminiscence of the marriage of Guy of Nevers with Mahaut of Burgundy in 1163. Both the children born of this union died early, the son in 1181 and the daughter in 1192. Besides, the descriptions of manners in *Amadas* and the details of both noble and bourgeois life point to a later date. So does the comparison of Amadas to Gawain, and the attribute of "mesure" as one of his characteristics.²⁸ Still these qualifications and the main idea of the poem, which is perfect love, and a perfect lover who conquers all other lovers in loyalty,²⁹ would hardly allow a later period for it than the closing years of the twelfth century.³⁰

Gröber's date for *Athis et Prophlias*, "about 1200," might also be subject to modification in favor of an earlier one. The assumption than the Alexander who wrote it was Alexander on

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 5294-5316. ¹⁹ *Charrete*, 26.

²⁰ Gröber, *l.c.*, pp. 588-589.

²¹ *Athis et Prophlias*, 1286-1287, 1476-1479.

²² Gröber, *l.c.*, pp. 586-588. ²³ *Partonopeus*, 5016.

²⁴ Gröber, *l.c.*, pp. 585-586; cf. *Ipomedon*, 10500-10514.

²⁵ Gröber, *l.c.*, pp. 531-532.

²⁶ *Amadas et Idoine*, 1989-999., 3723-3726, 6770-6773.

²⁷ See Fürster's Introduction, p. iii, note.

²⁸ *Amadas et Idoine*, 3786.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 6380-6383.

³⁰ Cf. G. Paris, *Romania*, vol. xxv, pp. 534-535.

Bernai would place it near the end of the century. Yet the view taken in it of woman, her constant submission to man, and her nullity in the choice of her own movements, while due without doubt to the spirit of the Eastern original, are so antagonistic to the ideals of gallantry and chivalry and the theoretical guidance of the sterner sex by the gentler, which were current in France from the middle of the twelfth century at least, that the time of its composition may be comparatively early. The debates and soliloquies sustained by the two friends were also much less in vogue after the eighties of the twelfth century than before. From such internal evidence the poem might be assigned to the years 1170-1180.

The time limits set by Gröber for *Partonopeus* (before 1188) could be supported by more evidence than he finds in *Florimont*. A device of the *Eneas* by which Lavinia reveals to her mother her love for Æneas is imitated in *Partonopeus*.³¹ Had the *Eneas* lost its novelty such open copying would scarcely have been attempted. *Ipomedon* contains a less direct imitation of the same passage, and *Ipomedon* can hardly have been composed after 1188.³² The very vigorous denunciation of a policy which puts commoners in office over nobles³³ seems too bold for the time of a monarch like Philip Augustus, and may refer to the closing years of the feeble Louis VII († 1180), while the characterization of the Gascons and Poitevins as politically restless and "tiring soon of one lord"³⁴ would be in order any time after their revolt against Henry II in 1168. The attribute of "mesure" as a desirable quality would also point to the same period of the later seventies and the eighties.

The general theme of the *romans d'aventure* previous to the thirteenth century, or more specifically previous to *Guillaume de Dole* (*Roman de la Rose*) is true love, its loyalty, endurance, trials, and rewards. As time passes, this idea, which at first shared its interest only with commonplace adventures of travel and combat, is crowded to some extent into the background by the poet's desire to present the manners and life of his own time. The narra-

tives become objective, self-conscious. *Ipomedon* is one of the first to devote much attention to such details, but it is soon followed by others, until with *Guillaume de Dole* one might say that the description of court life was the principal idea and the love story the subordinate. How sharply a division in time might be established, with *Cliges* as illustrative of the first style,³⁶ *Ipomedon* as showing the transition, and *Guillaume de Dole* as indicating the complete change of interest, could not be determined without the assistance of much more material than is now known. Still it is safe to assume that there was such a progression from the purely romantic to the realistic, or partially realistic, and by noting this progression it may be possible to determine approximate time limits for debatable poems. Acting on this theory, I would hazard some conjectures regarding *Guillaume de Palerne*, *Esconfle* and *Galeran*, which Gröber ranges from 1188 to the second or third decade of the thirteenth century.

First as to *Guillaume de Palerne*.³⁷ Its subject is on the trials and triumphs of true love, with very little attention paid to manners or court life. According to our theory the absence of this element would place the poem before *Ipomedon* in date. Yet there seems but little doubt that it was written after 1188,³⁸ and the prayer for Iolande's soul³⁹ would hint at middle age at least for the patroness. On the other hand, Alexander is celebrated here for his "sens et poesté,"⁴⁰ and not for his "largesse" as in the last years of the century. The hero also possesses "mesure,"⁴¹ a quality which appears to be no longer in fashion in *Guillaume de Dole*. A date near 1188 would, therefore, be preferable for the poem.

*Esconfle*⁴² contains much more definite indications in the way of chronology than *Guillaume de Palerne*. It was submitted for criticism to the "gentil conte en Hainaut,"⁴³ but without calling the count by name. Gröber, led by his impression of the rhymes and language of the poem (and influenced perhaps by the opinion of other authorities), has denied this office of critic to the last Baldwins of Hainaut, and has assumed that it was to be

³¹ *Partonopeus*, 7247 sqq. ³² Cf. *Ipomedon*, 1496-1517.

³³ *Partonopeus*, 2661 sqq. ³⁴ *Ibid.*, 7257.

³⁵ *Le Roman de la Rose, ou de Guillaume de Dole*, publié d'après le manuscrit du Vatican par G. Servois. Paris: Firmin Didot et Cie., 1893. 8vo, cxxi and 205 pp. (Soc. des Anc. Textes Fran. ais.)

³⁶ *Cliges*, 2354-2360.

³⁷ Gröber, *l. c.*, pp. 529-530.

³⁸ Cf. *Roman. Studien*, vol. iii, p. 131.

³⁹ *G. de Palerne*, 9660-9661.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 2085.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 619, 2730.

⁴² Gröber, *l. c.*, pp. 530-531.

⁴³ *Esconfle*, 9060-

exercised by the husbands of the countess Margaret. But in rejuvenating the age of the poem, by a decade or more, he has overlooked the probability that *Escoufle* was known to the author of *Guillaume de Dole*. A passage in *Escoufle* tells how, while walking one day with his friend Richard, the emperor of Rome proposes the marriage of his daughter, Alice, to Richard's son, William. Richard objects to the union as altogether above his son's rank and suggests the king of France as the proper husband for the princess. But when the emperor replies that he will assemble his barons and ask of them a "don" without revealing to them what it is, and assures Richard they will grant it, the latter's consent is at once forthcoming. So the barons are summoned, the emperor administers a dose of flattery to them, and asks the "don" "par amors." They grant it, and he then tells them it is the marriage of William and Alice. Their anger is of no avail now for they have given their word, and so they swear on the saints that William shall succeed to the empire.⁴⁴

In *Guillaume de Dole*,⁴⁵ the emperor Conrad and his friend William are riding together towards Cologne and talking confidentially. Conrad leads the conversation to the subject of William's sister and finally states his desire to marry her. William says that it cannot be, because the notables of the empire will oppose it; and he suggests that Conrad demand the hand of the daughter of the king of France. But Conrad says he will summon all the barons of Germany to a diet at Mainz and ask of them a "don" "par amors et par guerredon," which he is sure they will grant. He will then make them confirm the "don" by an oath so they may not retreat, and finally will tell them what it is. William consents to the stratagem.⁴⁶ But the plan is not carried out owing to the opposition and deceit of the seneschal.

There is hardly any doubt that *Escoufle* suggested this episode to the author of *Guillaume de Dole*. For in *Escoufle* the device is a part of the plot of the story and is made complete. In *Guillaume de Dole*, however, it is not put into effect and has no influence on the action of the poem. It only goes so far as to win William's approval to the marriage, which would have been given in any case. If any

stronger evidence of the connection of the two poems is needed it may be furnished by the solution of the story in *Guillaume de Dole*. In *Escoufle* it was the hawk which separated the lovers for a time and thus incurred the hero's enmity. In *Guillaume de Dole* that temporary obstacle is the seneschal. And the comparison suggests itself to the mind of the author:

Il n'en puet mès aler sanz perte,
Car il le tient pire qu'escoufles.⁴⁷

The "il" of the first line is evidently the seneschal, the "il" of the second, Conrad.

The priority of *Escoufle* to *Guillaume de Dole* would then be established. The latter is dated by Servois⁴⁸ between October, 1199, and May, 1201. The proofs given for this date do not seem conclusive, still the poem could hardly have been written after the defection of Renaud de Dammartin in May, 1212,⁴⁹ since this knight is especially eulogized by the author. Now, if *Escoufle* is earlier than *Guillaume de Dole*, the "conte en Hainaut" must be either Baldwin V or Baldwin VI. The former became Count of Flanders as well in 1191, a date perhaps too early for our poem. Baldwin VI, however, did not come into his estates till 1195, and already in the late summer of 1202 was on his way to the Holy Land. He had crossed himself in 1200. Therefore the latest date for *Escoufle* would be the summer of 1202. Internal evidence would also point to the same period. Commoners in power are denounced as vigorously as in *Partonopeus*. Richard had won the friendship and gratitude of the Roman emperor by delivering him from his "serfs" whom he had put over his nobles.⁵⁰ "Mesure" is a desirable quality,⁵¹ and Alexander is renowned for his "largesse."⁵² But the love story in *Escoufle* seem to divide with the descriptions of manners the attention of the poet and the interest of his hearers. For this reason, together with the allusion to Alexander, I would put it later than *Guillaume de Palerne*.

In certain respects *Galerans*⁵³ bears many resemblances to *Escoufle*. Its plot follows Marie de France's *lai* of Frêne, but much of the ma-

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 5402-5403. ⁴⁸ *L. c.*, pp. lxxxv-lxxxvi.

⁴⁹ Servois, *l. c.*, p. lii.

⁵⁰ *Escoufle*, 1482-1652; cf. *G. de Dole*, 574-591.

⁵¹ *Escoufle*, 5555.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 104.

⁵³ Grüber, *l. c.*, p. 527. He has taken the editor's total for the number of the lines, which are really less by twenty, line 5575 having been numbered 5595, and the error continuing. The manuscript is also defective at the beginning, not at the end.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 2136-2343.

⁴⁵ Grüber, *l. c.*, pp. 533-534.

⁴⁶ *G. de Dole*, 2969-3092.

terial was evidently suggested by *Esconfle* (if indeed it is not *Galeran* which gave the suggestions to the other). In both poems the heroines are thrown on their own resources, win the friendship of the daughter of a widow at whose house they lodge, and are accompanied by this daughter on their further wanderings. Both heroines also earn their living by their needle-work, and gain favor by their musical attainments. (These, however, are the accomplishments of gentle women and may have no special significance.) So the general impression is that the poems are not far apart. Both treat of the trials of true love and its ultimate triumph and in both there is considerable detail of middle-class as well as of court life.

If mediæval poets could be held to what might be termed historical accuracy more definite indications of an approximate date might be afforded by internal evidence in *Galeran*. The spirit of patriotism, or at least national pride, which grew so rapidly in France under Philip Augustus, breathes in many episodes of the poem. French and Germans dispute the favors of the Duke of Metz, and knights from all the provinces of North France join the issue of battle with Flemings and Germans.⁵⁴ This enthusiasm, however, would only indicate time limits of a whole generation or more. But the allusions to the duchy of Brittany may be subject to closer restrictions. *Galeran*, on his accession to the rule of that province, was obliged to cross the Channel and pay homage to the king of England at London. A truly patriotic Frenchman could hardly have admitted this overlordship after the excitement attending the death of Arthur of Brittany (1203), and the subsequent assertion of suzerainty over that duchy by Philip Augustus. At least it would hardly have been a pleasing concession, even in poetry, so long as the dispute lasted. When Philip reestablished the line of dukes in 1213 he exacted homage of the new ruler. After this period the French may not have been so sensitive to the question of overlordship for the province. The conclusion from this argument, then, would be that *Galeran* was written either before 1203, or a decade and more later. In favor of the earlier date is the plot taken bodily from *Frêne*, the likeness of manners to *Esconfle* and the strong influence of *Floire et Blanchefleur*. Also the quality of

⁵⁴ *Galeran*, 5475-5491, 5611 sqq.

"mesure" is vaunted in the poem,⁵⁵ and "gentilise" or "gentillesse," which is also eulogized in *Esconfle* and in *Guillaume de Dole*. The mention of sterlings as coin,⁵⁶ the use of heralds,⁵⁷ and the coats of arms painted on the shields⁵⁸ would indicate a period subsequent to *Esconfle*, but no later than *Guillaume de Dole*, where all three of these features appear. I would, therefore, conclude that *Galeran* was written after *Esconfle* and is a contemporary, or a predecessor even, of *Guillaume de Dole*. If this supposition is correct it is scarcely probable that its author worked later than the death of Arthur of Brittany, in 1203.

An interesting feature in *Galeran* is the influence of lyric poetry. Perhaps it is all the stronger here because a *lai* was its source. The hero himself composed a *lai* or "son nouvel"⁵⁹ which is analyzed in lines 1974-1980 and called

... au dit et au ton
Le lay Galeran le breton.⁶⁰

He teaches it to Frêne who plays an accompaniment to it on her harp, a scene which gives the poet one more occasion to relate the contents of the song.⁶¹ At this turn in the story a long description of spring also reveals the nearness of court lyric poetry.⁶²

But even more striking than these two passages are other places where it would seem as though there were the reminiscence of popular compositions, in contradistinction to the court "sons" and "lais." *Galeran's* song is full of that praise and blame of love which makes laughter and also tears, which causes the lover's sickness and again his health. But when Frêne goes to *Galeran's* wedding at La Roche-Guyon (a place already celebrated in the song of Bele Aëlis⁶³) she invents a song of her own:

Je vois aux noces mon amy:
Plus dolente de moy n'y va!⁶⁴

With this song she charms all the courtiers and the minstrels too. But the song is not court poetry. It is the song of the girl abandoned by her lover for another maiden. In it the woman is the wooer, the man the wooed. It is the constant theme of the lyric muse of the people. In a previous passage of the poem a song where love is preferred to all the wealth of the world,

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 1921, 3456.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 5929-5934.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 2296-2328.

⁶³ *G. de Dole*, 534.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 1572, 3279.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 1973.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 1984-2004.

⁶⁴ *Galeran*, 6987-6988.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 5947.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 1982-1983.

seems to rise above the monotonous flow of the octosyllabic line :

S'a femme me vouloit donner
Sa fille le roy d'Angleterre
Et acquitter toute la terre
Qu'il tient, et quanqu'en ont si homme,
Ne qu'il a de cy jusque(s) a Romme,
Ne la voudroie (je) prendre mie
Pour faire eschange de m'amie,
Qu'elle vault mieux que fille a roy,
Tant la voit on de grant aroy,⁶⁵

We are reminded at once of the "Chanson du roi Henri" of *Le Misanthrope*.

In his paragraph on *Guillaume de Dole*, or the *Roman de la Rose*, Gröber⁶⁶ states that he finds no trace of its influence on the *Violette*, nor of the *Violette* on it. The impression the latter gave me was that it had a predecessor in its own style. Still the only evidence to support this impression is very slight. The songs in the *Violette* are not so skilfully introduced as they are in the *Rose* (compare the beginnings of the two poems), from which one might argue that the poet relied on his audience's acquaintance with the kind and so hurried on to his objective point. It is also to be noted that the Châtelaine of Dijon, who is mentioned by name only in the *Rose* as the assumed sender of the love tokens to the seneschal, is the one who urges the hero of the *Violette* to sing the song that opened his lips and led to the boast which was the beginning of his sorrows.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

THE WANDERER 78-84.

It is not impossible that the disputed passage (ll. 78-84, particularly ll. 81-84) in the Anglo-Saxon poem *The Wanderer* may be best punctuated thus :

Wōriað þā wīnsalo ; wāldend licgað
drēame biðrorene ; duguð eal gecrong
wlanc bi wealle ;— sume wīg fornōm,
ferede in forðwege : sumne fugel opbær
ofer hāanne holm, sumne sē hāra wulf
dēaðe gedælde, sumne drēorighlēor
in eorðscrafe eorl gehjǣdde.

The discussion in Wülker's *Grundriss* (p. 206) has led to a wide acceptance, and in positive form, of Thorpe's suggestion, "fugel=ship?" (*Codex Ex.* p. 291); and the editors usually agree in placing a colon after *wealle*, and in

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 1741-1749.

⁶⁶ *L. c.*, pp. 533-534.

punctuating the following lines to indicate a series of coördinated mishaps (*vid. Ettmüller*, p. 217; Grein-Wülker, I, p. 288; Sweet, *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, seventh ed., p. 162). These two features of the interpretation are accepted by Professor Edward Fulton, who translates thus :

"Crumbling are the wine-halls, and the warriors lie
Shorn of their pleasure; scattered the retainers
Once proud on the wall: war has seized some,
Led them forth to their death; the fleet ship one
O'er the high sea has borne; the hoar wolf another
Has mangled in death; and dolefully one
In his bed of earth the earl has hidden."

[It is important for the following discussion to notice that wāldend ('lords') is here mistranslated by "warriors." The phrase "on the wall" must also be revised.]

The coördination of clauses after *wealle* is thus defined by Wülker (*Grundriss*, p. 206): "Es sind damit alle Todesarten aufgezählt: im Kriege, auf Seefahrten, auf der Jagd, durch Krankheit oder durch Alter." Brooke (*Hist. of Early Eng. Lit.*, p. 366, note) enlivens the matter in an interesting but wholly unwarranted manner:

"These are the various kinds of death,—death on the war-path: death on a sea-expedition, that is, death in a foreign land (*Fugel* is the war-ship); death, when outlawed, by a wolf; death in old age. and the earl weeps when he buries his friend in the barrow because he has not died in battle,—one of the pagan touches in the poem."

Brooke, however, has caught the spirit of the poem, and admits only the kinds of death which may befall athane. The poet has not digressed into a catalogue of "alle Todesarten;" he keeps his eye fixed upon the visior of the departed glory of the "hall," and laments the death of lords and of retainers. It is not the dwellings of men but the *wīnsalo* that 'wear into dust,' and the artistic demands of the counterpart, the death of the occupants of the 'wine-hall,' are strictly observed. Thus, *wāldend* and *duguð* complete the enumeration; the details which follow give precision and concreteness to the picture, and deepen its pathos.

The passage begins with three concise and complete statements (*Wōriað wealle*), but the death of the retainers, the last of the complete statements, is then expanded to relieve the severe compactness of the passage. This expansion is moreover demanded by the